

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC

Abbas Kazerounian, Esq. (SBN: 249203)

ak@kazlg.com

Jason A. Ibey, Esq. (SBN: 284607)

jason@kazlg.com

2700 N. Main Street, Suite 1000

Santa Ana, California 92705

Telephone: (800) 400-6808

Facsimile: (800) 520-5523

HYDE & SWIGART

Joshua B. Swigart, Esq. (SBN: 225557)

josh@westcoastlitigation.com

2221 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 101

San Diego, CA 92108

Telephone: (619) 233-7770

Facsimile: (619) 297-1022

Attorneys for Plaintiff,

Geraldine F. Robinson

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**GERALDINE F. ROBINSON,
Individually and On Behalf of All
Others Similarly Situated,**

Plaintiff,

v.

CREDIT CONTROL, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No.: '13CV1672 DMS WVG

CLASS ACTION

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF PURSUANT
TO THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER
PROTECTION ACT, 47 U.S.C. § 227,
ET SEQ.**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

INTRODUCTION

1. GERALDINE F. ROBINSON (“Plaintiff”) brings this Class Action Complaint for damages, injunctive relief, and any other available legal or equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal actions of CREDIT CONTROL, LLC (“Defendant”) in negligently and/or intentionally contacting Plaintiff on Plaintiff’s cellular telephone, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., (“TCPA”), thereby invading Plaintiff’s privacy. Plaintiff alleges as follows upon personal knowledge as to herself and her own acts and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief, including investigation conducted by her attorneys.
2. The TCPA was designed to prevent calls like the ones described within this complaint, and to protect the privacy of citizens like Plaintiff. “Voluminous consumer complaints about abuses of telephone technology – for example, computerized calls dispatched to private homes – prompted Congress to pass the TCPA.” *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740, 744 (2012).
3. In enacting the TCPA, Congress intended to give consumers a choice as to how creditors and telemarketers may call them, and made specific findings that “[t]echnologies that might allow consumers to avoid receiving such calls are not universally available, are costly, are unlikely to be enforced, or place an inordinate burden on the consumer. TCPA, Pub.L. No. 102–243, § 11. Toward this end, Congress found that:

[b]anning such *automated* or prerecorded telephone calls to the home, except when the receiving party consents to receiving the call or when such calls are necessary in an emergency situation affecting the health and safety of the consumer, is the only effective means of protecting telephone consumers from this nuisance and privacy invasion.

Id. at § 12 (emphasis added); *see also Martin v. Leading Edge Recovery Solutions, LLC*, 2012 WL 3292838, at *4 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 10, 2012) (citing Congressional findings on TCPA’s purpose).

4. Congress also specifically found that “the evidence presented to the Congress indicates that *automated* or prerecorded calls are a nuisance and an invasion of privacy, regardless of the type of call....” *Id.* at §§ 12-13. *See also, Mims*, 132 S. Ct. at 744 (emphasis added.)
5. As Judge Easterbrook of the Seventh Circuit recently explained in a TCPA case regarding calls similar to this one:

The Telephone Consumer Protection Act ... is well known for its provisions limiting junk-fax transmissions. A less-litigated part of the Act curtails the use of automated dialers and prerecorded messages to cell phones, whose subscribers often are billed by the minute as soon as the call is answered—and routing a call to voicemail counts as answering the call. An automated call to a landline phone can be an annoyance; an automated call to a cell phone adds expense to annoyance.

Soppet v. Enhanced Recovery Co., LLC, 679 F.3d 637, 638 (7th Cir. 2012).

6. The Ninth Circuit recently affirmed certification of a TCPA class case similar to this one in *Meyer v. Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC*, __ F.3d __, 2012 WL 4840814 (9th Cir. Oct. 12, 2012).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. This Court has federal question jurisdiction because this case arises out of violation of federal law. 47 U.S.C. §227(b); *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740 (2012).
8. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because the harm to Plaintiff occurred in San Diego, California, and Defendant is subject to personal

jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, State of California as it conducts business there.

PARTIES

9. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a citizen and resident of the State of Nevada. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a Missouri corporation whose primary corporate address is in Hazelwood, Missouri.

11. Defendant, is and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation and is a “person,” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

12. Defendant provides receivables management services to various organizations nationwide.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

13. On or about April 26, 2013, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on Plaintiff’s cellular telephone number ending in 6566 via an automatic telephone dialing system (“ATDS”) as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1), using an “artificial or prerecorded voice” as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

14. This ATDS has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator.

15. At no time did Plaintiff enter into a business relationship with Defendant.

16. At no time did Plaintiff provide Plaintiff’s cellular telephone number ending in 6566 to Defendant through any medium.

17. Defendant obtained Plaintiff’s contact information through unknown means.

18. At the time the prerecorded voice message was received by Plaintiff on Plaintiff’s cellular telephone, Plaintiff was present in the County of San Diego, State of California.

///

1 19. Upon information and belief, Defendant was attempting to collect a debt
2 from someone other than Plaintiff by means of the autodialed and
3 prerecorded voice message. Plaintiff does not know the person that
4 Defendant was attempting to contact in an attempt to collect a debt.

5 20. The telephone number Defendant called was assigned to a cellular telephone
6 service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls pursuant to 47
7 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

8 21. The telephone call constituted a call that was not for emergency purposes as
9 defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(i).

10 22. Plaintiff did not provide Defendant or its agent prior express consent to
11 receive calls to her cellular telephone utilizing an ATDS or artificial or
12 prerecorded voice, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).

13 23. The telephone call by Defendant, or its agent, violated 47 U.S.C. §
14 227(b)(1).

15 CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

16 24. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of all others
17 similarly situated (the "Class").

18 25. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of the Class, consisting of:

19 All persons within the United States who received any
20 telephone call/s from Defendant or its agent to said
21 person's cellular telephone made through the use of any
22 automatic telephone dialing system or with an artificial
23 or prerecorded voice within the four years prior to the
24 filing of the Complaint.

25 26. Defendant and its employees or agents are excluded from the Class.
26 Plaintiff does not know the number of members in the Class, but believes the
27 Class members number in the tens of thousands, if not more. This matter
28 should therefore be certified as a Class action to assist in the expeditious
litigation of this matter.

27. Plaintiff and members of the Class were harmed by the acts of Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant, either directly or through its agents, illegally contacted Plaintiff and the Class members via their cellular telephones by using an ATDS and/or artificial or prerecorded voice, thereby causing Plaintiff and the Class members to incur certain cellular telephone charges or reduce cellular telephone time for which Plaintiff and the Class members previously paid, and invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and the Class members. Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby.

28. This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of economic injury on behalf of the Class, and it expressly is not intended to request any recovery for personal injury and claims related thereto. Plaintiff reserves the right to expand the Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional persons as warranted as facts are learned in further investigation and discovery.

29. The joinder of the Class members is impractical and the disposition of their claims in the Class action will provide substantial benefits both to the parties and to the court. The Class can be identified through Defendant's records or Defendant's agents' records.

30. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented. The questions of law and fact to the Class predominate over questions which may affect individual Class members, including the following:

- a) Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of the Complaint, Defendant or its agents sent any artificial or prerecorded voice message to the Class (other than a message made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using any automatic dialing system to any telephone number assigned to a cellular phone service;

b) Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and,

c) Whether Defendant and its agents should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.

31. As a person who received at least one prerecorded voice call utilizing an ATDS without Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of the Class. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class in that Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to any member of the Class.

32. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have all suffered irreparable harm as a result of the Defendant's unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class action, the Class will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy and Defendant will likely continue such illegal conduct. Because of the size of the individual Class member's claims, few, if any, Class members could afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.

33. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in handling class action claims and claims involving violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

34. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce Defendant to comply with federal and California law. The interest of Class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendant is small because the maximum statutory damages in an individual action for violation of privacy are minimal. Management of these claims is likely to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class claims.

///

///

35. Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

36. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

37. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

38. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

39. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE

TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

40. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

41. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

42. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to an award of \$1,500.00 in

1 statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §
2 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

3 43.Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief
4 prohibiting such conduct in the future.

5 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

6 Wherefore, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court grant Plaintiff and the Class
7 members the following relief against Defendant:

8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENT VIOLATION OF**
9 **THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

- 10 • As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1),
11 Plaintiff seeks for herself and each Class member \$500.00 in statutory
12 damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §
13 227(b)(3)(B).
14 • Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such
15 conduct in the future.
16 • Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

17 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF**
18 **THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

- 19 • As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C.
20 § 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for herself and each Class member \$1,500.00
21 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C.
22 § 227(b)(3)(B).
23 • Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such
24 conduct in the future.
25 • Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

TRIAL BY JURY

44. Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demands, a trial by jury.

Dated: July 17, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC

By: /s/ Abbas Kazerounian
Abbas Kazerounian
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF